



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1470
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/848,372

05/04/2001

Hideo Takiguchi

35.C15356

6793

5514

7590

11/21/2006

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER

KE, PENG

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2174

DATE MAILED: 11/21/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/848,372

Applicant(s)

TAKIGUCHI, HIDEO

Examiner

Peng Ke

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 2 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 July 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 34-63 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 34-63 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This action is responsive to communications: Amendment, filed on 7/31/06.

Claims 34-63 are pending in this application. Claims 34, 46-48, 49, and 54-60 are independent claims. In the Amendment, filed on 7/31/06, claims 34, 46-48, 49, and 54-60 were amended.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 49-50, 53-60, and 62-63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson U.S. Patent No. 6,215,523 (Hereafter this patent will be referred to as Anderson II) in view of Fellegara et al. US Patent 6,441,854

As per claim 49, Anderson II teaches an image processing apparatus comprising:

A capturing unit adapted to capture a reduction image stored in a storage medium;
(figure 8, item 110)

A display control unit adapted to cause a display device change, sequentially, display of images each larger than, and each corresponding to, a respective reduction image captured by said capturing units; (column 6, lines 63-column 7, lines 24, column 12, lines 35-65).

Art Unit: 2174

A registering unit adapted to register, from among a series of image displayed by said display control unit, image indicated by a user as a target of single process. (col. 10, lines 50-col. 11, lines 10);

However, Anderson II fails to teach automatic sequential display of larger size images.

Fellegara teaches automatic sequential display of larger size images. (column 14, lines 20-55)

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Fellegara's teaching with method of Anderson II in order to provide user with the ability to automatically scroll the image after predetermined time periods.

As per claim 50, Anderson II and Fellegara teach the apparatus according to claim 49. Anderson II further teaches wherein the specific image process includes a print process (col. 7, lines 1-32).

As per claim 53, Anderson II and Fellegara teach an image processing apparatus according to claim 49. Anderson II further teaches wherein an application program corresponding to the specific image process automatically starts after the end of the display by said second display control unit (column 12, lines 56 – column 13, lines 15).

As per claim 54, Anderson II teaches an image processing apparatus comprising:

A capturing unit adapted to capture images stored in a storage medium; (column 2, lines 35-46)

Art Unit: 2174

A display control unit adapted to control so that the images captured by said capturing unit are displayed on a display device as a slideshow; (column 12, lines 56-column 13, lines 15) and

A registering unit adapted to register, from among a series of images displayed by said display control unit, an image indicated by a user as a target of a specific process. (figure 8, items 700, and 704)

However, Anderson II fails to teach automatic sequential display of larger size images.

Fellegara teaches automatic sequential display of larger size images. (column 14, lines 20-55)

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Fellegara's teaching with method of Anderson II in order to provide user with the ability to automatically scroll the image after predetermined time periods.

As per claims 55-57, they are rejected with the same rationale as claim 49. Supra.

As per claims 58-60, they are rejected with the same rationale as claim 54. Supra.

As per claim 62, which is dependent on claim 49, Anderson II teaches the claim 49. Anderson II further teaches wherein information indicating the process target is displayed together with the selected image. (figure 8, items 700, and 704)

As per claim 63, which is dependent on claim 54, it is of the same scope as claim 62. Supra.

Art Unit: 2174

Claim 51 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson II U.S. Patent No. 6,215,523 in view of in view of Fellegara US Patent 6,441,854 further in view of Chui et al., U.S. Patent no. 6,657,702.

As per claim 51, Anderson II and Fellegara teach the apparatus of claim 49. However, Anderson II does not teach the apparatus that is able to perform an electronic mail transmission process.

Chui teaches an apparatus that is able to perform an electronic mail transmission process. (see Chui, column 17, lines 25 – 32).

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Chui's teaching with the modified Anderson II to allow user to transmit images through the Internet.

Claim 52 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson II U.S. Patent No. 6,215,523 in view of Fellegara US Patent 6,441,854 further in view Anderson et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,680,749.

As per claim 52, Anderson II and Fellegara teach an image processing apparatus according to claim 49. Anderson II fails to teach wherein said execution indication unit can select whether or not to execute plural kinds of image processes.

Anderson teaches an execution indication unit can select whether or not to execute plural kinds of image processes. (column 13, lines 25-68)

Art Unit: 2174

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Anderson's teaching with method of Anderson II in order to allow a user to integrate a user interface across multiple operating modes of a digital imaging device.

Claims 34, 36-40, 44-48, and 61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,680,749 in view of Dow et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,549,304 further in view of Anderson II U.S. Patent No. 6,215,523, further in view of Fellegara et al. US Patent 6,441,854

As per claim 34, Anderson teaches an image processing apparatus comprising:
a capturing unit adapted to capture a reduction image from a storage medium storing storage images, the reduction images respectively corresponding to the storage images (col. 5, lines 55-57 and col. 6, lines 67- col. 7, line 4);

a first display control unit adapted to cause a display device to display the reduction images captured by said capturing unit (fig. 13, item 852 and col. 12, lines 52-55);

a first selection indication unit adapted to select and indicate those reduction images which are to be subjected to a specific image process, from the reduction images displayed on the display device (col. 13, lines 1-5);

an execution indication unit adapted to select and indicate which of the storage images are to be subjected to the specific image process, by selecting a corresponding larger size image sequentially displayed by said second display control unit (col. 12, lines 65-66 and column 13, lines 17-21);

Art Unit: 2174

However, Anderson fails to teach a specifying unit adapted to specify as a group, as a target of the specific image process, the storage images corresponding to the larger size images indicated by said execution indication unit, upon completion of the display by said second display control unit.

Dow et al. teaches specifying unit adapted to specify as a group, as a target of the specific image process, the storage images corresponding to the larger size images indicated by said execution indication unit, upon completion of the display by said second display control unit. (column 6, lines 13-63)

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Dow's teaching with Anderson's apparatus to allow user to arrange and index images as a group.

However, they both fail to teach a second display control unit adapted to cause after selection by said first selection indication unit, to sequentially display a of larger size images, the larger size images including a respective larger size image for each of the reduction images indicated by said first selection indication unit;

Anderson II teaches a second display control unit adapted to cause after selection by said first selection indication unit, to sequentially display a of larger size images, the larger size images including a respective larger size image for each of the reduction images indicated by said first selection indication unit (column 6, lines 63-column 7, lines 24, column 12, lines 35-65).

Art Unit: 2174

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Anderson II's teaching with apparatus of Anderson and Dow to view the full image in a slide show.

However, they fail to teach automatic sequential display of larger size images.

Fellegara teaches automatic sequential display of larger size images. (column 14, lines 20-55)

It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include Fellegara's teaching with method of Anderson, Dow, and Anderson II in order to provide user with the ability to automatic scroll the image after predetermined time periods.

As per claim 36, Anderson, Dow, Anderson II, and Fellegara teach an image processing apparatus according to claim 34. Anderson further teaches wherein said second display control unit causes the display device to display any one of the images to be displayed. (col. 12, lines 65-66)

As per claim 37, Anderson, Dow, Anderson II, and Fellegara teach an image processing apparatus according to claim 36. Anderson further teaches wherein said second display control unit causes the display device to further display an indication section for changing the image to be displayed on the display device. (fig 13)

As per claim 38, Anderson, Dow, Anderson II, and Fellegara teach an image processing apparatus according to claim 34. Anderson further teaches wherein an application program corresponding to the specific image process automatically starts after the end of the display by said second display control unit (column 9, lines 46 – 63).

Art Unit: 2174

As per claim 39, Anderson, Dow, Anderson II, and Fellegara teach an image processing apparatus according to claim 34. Anderson further teaches wherein said execution indication unit can select whether or not to execute plural kinds of image processes (col. 9, lines 15-45).

As per claim 40, Anderson, Dow, Anderson II, and Fellegara teach an image processing apparatus according to claim 34. Anderson further teaches wherein the specific image process includes a print process (col. 13, lines 20-21).

As per claim 44, Anderson, Dow, Anderson II, and Fellegara teach an image processing apparatus according to claim 34. Anderson further teaches wherein the specific image process includes a transfer process of transferring the storage image to a desired storage area (col. 13, lines 20 – 21).

As per claim 45, Anderson, Dow, Anderson II, and Fellegara teach an image processing apparatus according to claim 34. Anderson further teaches wherein the storage medium is included in a digital camera (col. 4, lines 43 – 45 and col. 6, lines 2 – 5).

As per claim 46, it is rejected with the same rationale as claim 34. (see rejection above)

As per claim 47, it is rejected with the same rationale as claim 34. (see rejection above)

As per claim 48, it is rejected with the same rationale as claim 34. (see rejection above)

Art Unit: 2174

As per claim 35, Anderson, Dow, Anderson II, and Fellegara teach an image processing apparatus according to claim 34. Anderson II further teaches second display control unit performs a slide show display, and wherein the storage image corresponding to each of the reduction images selected by said selection indication unit is displayed as the larger image (col. 7, lines 1-24).

As per claim 61, Anderson Dow, and Anderson II teach an image processing apparatus according to claim 34. Anderson II further teaches providing information indicating the process target is displayed together with the selected image. (figure 8, items 700, and 704)

Claim 41 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,680,749 in view of Dow et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,549,304 further in view of Anderson II U.S. Patent No. 6,215,523. further in view of Fellegara et al. US Patent 6,441,854 further in view of Takakura et al., U.S. Patent no. 5,752,053.

As per claim 41, Anderson, Dow, Anderson II, and Fellegara teach an image processing apparatus according to claim 40. However they fail to teach the apparatus comprising an editing operation accepting unit adapted to accept a user's operation to edit arrangements of the images to be printed and print sizes thereof in the print process.

Takakura et al. teaches the apparatus comprising an editing operation accepting unit adapted to accept a user's operation to edit arrangements of the images to be printed and print sizes thereof in the print process(see Takakura, column 2, lines 44 – 49). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Takakura with the method of Anderson, Dow, Anderson II,

Art Unit: 2174

and Fellegara in order to allow a user to input an edit to arbitrary positions while observing a state of print binding.

Claims 42 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anderson et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,680,749 in view of Dow et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,549,304 further in view of Anderson II, U.S. Patent No. 6,215,523 in view of Fellegara et al. US Patent 6,441,854 further in view of Chui et al., U.S. Patent no. 6,657,702.

As per claim 42, Anderson, Dow, Anderson II, and Fellegara teach an image processing apparatus according to claim 34. However they fail to teach wherein the specific image process includes an electronic mail transmission process. Chui et al. ("Chui") teaches wherein an image processing is a mail transmission processing (see Chui, column 17, lines 25 – 32).). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of Chui with the method of Anderson, Dow, Anderson II, and Fellegara in order to allow the users to distribute images to recipients not located near the user.

As per claim 43, Anderson, Dow, Anderson II, Fellegara and Chui teach an image processing apparatus according to claim 42, Chui further teaches the apparatus comprises an electronic mail formation control unit adapted to control to perform a new electronic mail formation process of attaching the image indicated to be transmitted as electronic mail, in the electronic mail transmission process. (see Chui, column 17, lines 25 – 32).

Art Unit: 2174

Argument

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 34-63 have been considered but are deemed to be moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peng Ke whose telephone number is (571) 272-4062. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th and Alternate Fridays 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine L. Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Peng Ke

Kristine Kincaid
KINETIC TECHNOLOGIES, INC.
SUPERVISOR
TECHNOLOGY CENTER